

Local Work Group development of local EQIP

Wadena SWCD District FY09 EQIP

1. List the local resource concerns that EQIP can address:

Water Quality: 1) Problems- surface water pollution, groundwater pollution, Nitrogen in groundwater, overall water quality, wind erosion deposition of sediment in ditches/watercourses; 2) Solutions- buffers, grazing plans, windbreaks, field breaks, tree plantings, feedlot remediation, wetland restoration, and cover crops.

Soil Erosion: 1) Problems- wind erosion, water erosion, bare fields in fall (recreational tillage), soils, overgrazing; 2) Solutions- trees, filter strips, irrigation corner cover, residue management, cover crops.

Wildlife Habitat/Forestry: 1) Problems- missing bird species, habitat, early succession habitat, upland wildlife habitat, diversity, disease, invasive species, lowland forests threatened species, ash decline; 2) Solutions- Reforestation on abandoned fields, restorations-wetlands also, invasive species management.

Invasive Species and Diseases: 1) Problems- Buckthorn, thistles, spotted knapweed, jack pine bud worm, weeds/shrubs (invasive); 2) Solutions- Invasive Species Management, Education, Outreach

Others: 1) Rotational Grazing, Recreational Land, Biofuels Diversity, Center Pivots, Low Pressure Conversions

2. If applicable, list any geographic regions (i.e. watersheds, townships, etc.) and their respective resource concerns within the District to receive priority:

A few were listed by LWG members including: shell river pivots, outwash sand plains, crow Wing River, all watercourses/water bodies, etc. However, after discussion there was not a majority of LWG members who wanted to prioritize any one of these over the entire county.

3. From items 1 & 2 above prioritize the local resource concerns to be addressed with EQIP funding for the district. Describe a minimum of 3 categories of the highest priority applications which you would want to receive funding.

1st- Water Quality

2nd- Soil Erosion

3rd- Invasive Species, Forestry, and Wildlife

4th- Irrigation, Low Pressure Conversions

4. Develop a minimum of 3 and maximum of 12 yes/no questions to determine if an application is addressing the high priority concerns described in item 3.

- 1) A producer will install practices that will improve water quality on active or idle cropland or livestock operations. 20 points
- 2) A producer will install practices that reduce soil erosion on active cropland. 15 points
- 3) A producer will implement irrigation practices to conserve water. 10 points
- 4) A producer will implement forestry practices or invasive species management. 8 points
- 5) A producer will implement a practice in a forest stewardship plan. 5 points
- 6) A producer will implement a practice that benefits wildlife habitat. 5 points

5. Assign points to the questions in Item #4 as desired to reflect local priorities. The total points assigned to the questions should be between 35 to 60 points.

Points are already assigned above. The last 3 questions are related to the 3rd highest priority of forestry, wildlife, and invasive species. However, the group did not want to tier the questions to make them contingent upon each other thus penalizing applications that also scored points in other categories (e.g. wildlife benefits under filter strips wouldn't receive points if forestry and a FSP were required, etc.). This way each stands on its own, but will compound the points when other benefits are also achieved.

We are requesting an additional 3 points above the maximum of 60 to prioritize the invasive species/forestry practices above the irrigation practices. There was a distinct separation between these two priorities, and the SWCD has a strong forestry and FSP program along with an invasive species grant program, and local producer interest is high. A good example of why we need the additional 3 points is if a person does an invasive species or forestry project, but doesn't have a FSP then they will only receive 10 points. This would only tie with irrigation practice points, which were much lower in priority. Also many members of the LWG believe the local priorities should entail over 50% of the total score, and past years ranking questions did not prioritize contracts based on local issues. It was also felt that if we lowered the points elsewhere we would be lowering the local points in comparison to state and national points (i.e. stealing points from other local priorities and making state and national points more influential on setting the application priorities.

6. Submit this worksheet electronically to your respective ASTC(FO). After approval from the state office, the questions will be entered into the Local Issues section of the ranking tool. The local EQIP program description, cost-share docket changes, and ranking worksheet must be reviewed and approved by the State Conservationist before any EQIP contract is approved and signed.

This document serves as the Local Work Group recommendation for FY 09 EQIP.
Attached is a roster of participation in the Local Work Group.

<u>Tom Schulz, Wadena SWCD Board Supervisor</u>	<u>11/5/2008</u>
Chair, Local Work Group	Date

EQIP 2009 Listening Session & LWG Meeting Attendance

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>
1) Julie Schemerhorn	Wadena FSA
2) Malinda Dexter	Wadena SWCD
3) Rob Naplin	DNR Wildlife
4) Rob Rabasco	DNR Wildlife
5) Ken Berg	Wadena SWCD Board Supervisor
6) Marvin Runyan	Wadena SWCD Board Supervisor
7) Lonnie Lily	DNR Forestry
8) Tom Schulz	Wadena SWCD Board Supervisor
9) Nancy Benson	Wadena SWCD Board Supervisor
10) Bill Haugen	Concerned Citizen/Forestry Consultant
11) John Finnegan	Leaf River Township Board Member
12) Orville Meyer	Wadena County Commissioner
13) Molly Costin	Wadena SWCD
14) Kari Tomperi	Wadena SWCD
15) Ivan Reinke	Wadena NRCS
16) Russell Kleinschmidt	Wadena NRCS